

Lattices of Equivalence Relations Closed Under the Operations of Relation Algebras

JEREMY F. ALM AND JOHN W. SNOW

ABSTRACT. One of the longstanding problems in universal algebra is the question of which finite lattices are isomorphic to the congruence lattices of finite algebras. This question can be phrased as which finite lattices can be represented as lattices of equivalence relations on finite sets closed under certain first order formulas. We generalize this question to a different collection of first-order formulas, giving examples to demonstrate that our new question is distinct. We then prove that every lattice $\mathbf{M}_n$ can be represented in this new way. [This is an extended version of a paper submitted to *Algebra Universalis*.]

1. Introduction

One of the longstanding problems in universal algebra is,

Problem 1.1. Finite Congruence Lattice Representation Problem: *For which finite lattices $\mathbf{L}$ is there a finite algebra $\mathbf{A}$ with $\mathbf{L} \cong \text{Con}\mathbf{A}$?*

A *primitive positive formula* is a first-order formula of the form $\exists \wedge (\text{atomic})$. Suppose that $\mathcal{R}$ is a set of relations on a finite set A . Let $\text{PPF}(\mathcal{R})$ be the set of all relations on A definable using primitive positive formulas and relations from $\mathcal{R}$. Let $\text{Eq}(\mathcal{R})$ be the set of all equivalence relations in $\mathcal{R}$. It follows from [1, 6] that $\mathcal{R}$ is the set of all universes of direct powers of an algebra $\mathbf{A}$ with universe A if and only if $\text{PPF}(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}$. (For references on similar characterizations, the reader can see [5].) Therefore, Problem 1.1 can be restated in the following way.

Problem 1.2. *For which finite lattices $\mathbf{L}$ is there a lattice $\mathcal{L}$ of equivalence relations on a finite set so that $\mathbf{L} \cong \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \text{Eq}(\text{PPF}(\mathcal{L}))$?*

A natural extension of this problem is to consider first-order definitions employing types of formulas other than primitive positive formulas. We suggest replacing primitive positive formulas here with any first-order formulas using at most three variables. If $\mathcal{R}$ is a set of relations on a finite set A , let $\text{FO3}(\mathcal{R})$ be the set of all relations on A definable using first-order formulas with at most three variables and relations from $\mathcal{R}$. Our extension of 1.2 can be stated as:

Problem 1.3. *For which finite lattices $\mathbf{L}$ is there a lattice $\mathcal{L}$ of equivalence relations on a finite set so that $\mathbf{L} \cong \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \text{Eq}(\text{FO3}(\mathcal{L}))$?*

Date: September 28, 2012.

Our interest in first-order formulas with three variables stems from a connection with relation algebras. A *relation algebra* is an algebra $\mathbf{A} = \langle A, +, \bar{\cdot}, \cdot, \cup, 1 \rangle$ with operations intended to mimic the operations of union, complement, composition, converse, and identity on binary relations. A relation algebra $\mathbf{A}$ is *representable* if there is a set of binary relations $\mathcal{R}$ on a set B so that $\mathbf{A}$ is isomorphic to the algebra $\langle \mathcal{R}, \cup, \bar{\cdot}, \circ, \cdot, 1_B \rangle$. A set $\mathcal{R}$ of binary relations on a finite set A is closed under the relation algebra operations if and only if every binary relation on A definable with a first-order formula with at most three variables and relations in $\mathcal{R}$ is already in $\mathcal{R}$ (see Theorem 3.32 of [2] or page 172 of [7]). For any set $\mathcal{R}$ of binary relations on a set A , let $\text{RA}(\mathcal{R})$ be the relation algebra generated by $\mathcal{R}$. Then the above problem becomes:

Problem 1.4. *For which finite lattices $\mathbf{L}$ is there a lattice $\mathcal{L}$ of equivalence relations on a finite set so that $\mathbf{L} \cong \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{L}))$?*

For any relation algebra $\mathbf{A}$, let $\text{Eq}(\mathbf{A})$ be equivalence relation elements of $\mathbf{A}$. Then our problem becomes:

Problem 1.5. *For which finite lattices $\mathbf{L}$ is there a relation algebra $\mathbf{A}$ which is representable on a finite set so that $\mathbf{L} \cong \text{Eq}(\mathbf{A})$?*

2. Examples

In this section we give two examples $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ of lattices of equivalence relations on finite sets. In the first example, $\text{Eq}(\text{PPF}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}$ but $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{L})) \neq \mathcal{L}$. In the second example, $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{M}$ but $\text{Eq}(\text{PPF}(\mathcal{M})) \neq \mathcal{M}$. This demonstrates that these two notions are indeed distinct.

First, let $\mathbf{2}$ be the two-element lattice with universe $\{0, 1\}$. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{2}^2$, and let $\mathcal{L} = \text{Con}\mathbf{A}$. Then $\mathcal{L}$ contains four equivalence relations – the identity relation, the universal relation, and the kernels of the projection homomorphisms. The projection kernels are the relations η_0 and η_1 defined so that $(x_0, x_1)\eta_0(y_0, y_1)$ when $x_0 = y_0$ and $(x_0, x_1)\eta_1(y_0, y_1)$ when $x_1 = y_1$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is a congruence lattice, $\text{Eq}(\text{PPF}(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}$. However, $\text{RA}(\mathcal{L})$ also contains the equivalence relation

$$\gamma = 1' \cup \overline{(\eta_0 \cup \eta_1)}$$

which is not in $\mathcal{L}$, so $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{L})) \neq \mathcal{L}$. Note that the relation γ can also be defined with this first-order formula which only uses *two* variables:

$$x\gamma y \leftrightarrow (x = y) \vee \neg[(x\eta_0 y) \vee (x\eta_1 y)].$$

Thus $\mathcal{L}$ is closed under primitive positive definitions but not under the operations of relation algebras or first-order definitions using at most three variables.

For our second example, suppose that $p \geq 5$ is prime. We consider $\text{Con}(\mathbb{Z}_p^2)$, which is a copy of $\mathbf{M}_{p+1}$ consisting of the identity $1'$, the universal relation 1 , and

$p + 1$ atoms $\eta_0, \eta_1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{p-1}$, given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \eta_0 \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle &\leftrightarrow x_0 = y_0 \\
\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \eta_1 \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle &\leftrightarrow x_1 = y_1 \\
\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \alpha_1 \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle &\leftrightarrow 1x_0 - x_1 = 1y_0 - y_1 \\
\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \alpha_2 \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle &\leftrightarrow 2x_0 - x_1 = 2y_0 - y_1 \\
&\vdots \\
\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \alpha_k \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle &\leftrightarrow kx_0 - x_1 = ky_0 - y_1 \\
&\vdots \\
\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \alpha_{p-1} \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle &\leftrightarrow (p-1)x_0 - x_1 = (p-1)y_0 - y_1
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that $1 \leq n < p-2$ and let $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 1', \eta_0, \eta_1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$. Then $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{M}$.*

This lemma follows from [4]; the result is not explicitly stated in the paper, although it can be extracted from it. A proof is given in Section 3.

Consider the relation α_{p-1} (which is not in $\mathcal{M}$); α_{p-1} can be defined from η_0 , η_1 , and α_1 with a primitive positive formula by

$$a\alpha_{p-1}b \leftrightarrow \exists c, d (a\eta_0c \wedge c\eta_1b \wedge a\eta_1d \wedge d\eta_0b \wedge c\alpha_1d).$$

Thus $\text{Eq}(\text{PPF}(\mathcal{M})) \neq \mathcal{M}$. The lattice $\mathcal{M}$ is closed under the operations of relation algebras and first-order definitions using at most three variables but not under primitive positive definitions.

This second example has the following interesting consequence. If $n \geq 1$ and if $p \geq 5$ is a prime greater than $n + 2$, then the lattice $\mathcal{M}$ in the example gives a lattice of equivalence relations closed under the operations of relation algebras which is isomorphic to $\mathbf{M}_{n+2}$. Note that $\mathbf{M}_1$ and $\mathbf{M}_2$ can easily be represented by letting $\mathcal{M}$ be $\{1, 1', \eta_0\}$ and $\{1, 1', \eta_0, \eta_1\}$, respectively. Thus we have

Theorem 2.2. *For any positive integer n , there is a lattice $\mathcal{M}$ of equivalence relations on a finite set so that $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbf{M}_n$ and $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M})) = \text{Eq}(\text{FO3}(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{M}$.*

3. Proof of Lemma 2.1

In this section, we prove that $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{M}$. Again, the results in this section are implicit in [4], but the relationship is not immediately apparent; hence we provide “bottom-up” proofs here.

Lemma 3.1. *For distinct atoms α and β of $\mathcal{M}$, $\alpha \circ \beta = 1$.*

Proof. There are two nontrivial cases.

Case 1: $\eta_i \circ \alpha_k$.

Suppose for simplicity that $i = 0$. Then let $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle$ and $\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$ be any pairs in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2$. We will show $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle \eta_0 \circ \alpha_k \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$. Let $\langle y_0, y_1 \rangle = \langle u_0, ku_0 + v_1 - kv_0 \rangle$. Then $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle \eta_0 \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle$. We need to show $\langle y_0, y_1 \rangle \alpha_k \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} ky_0 - y_1 &= ky_0 - (ku_0 + v_1 - kv_0) \\ &= ku_0 - ku_0 - v_1 + kv_0 \\ &= kv_0 - v_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\langle y_0, y_1 \rangle \alpha_k \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$.

Case 2: $\alpha_i \circ \alpha_j, i \neq j$.

Again, let $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle, \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2$. We need $\langle y_0, y_1 \rangle$ such that

$$iu_0 - u_1 = iy_0 - y_1 \text{ and } jy_0 - y_1 = jv_0 - v_1.$$

Since $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is a field, we can find $y_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that

$$(j - i)y_0 = u_1 - iu_0 + jv_0 - v_1,$$

so

$$iy_0 = jy_0 - u_1 + iu_0 - jv_0 + v_1,$$

and let

$$y_1 = j(y_0 - v_0) + v_1.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} iy_0 - y_1 &= jy_0 - u_1 + iu_0 - jv_0 + v_1 - y_1 \\ &= jy_0 - u_1 + iu_0 - jv_0 + v_1 - [jy_0 - jv_0 + v_1] \\ &= iu_0 - u_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle \alpha_i \langle y_0 - y_1 \rangle$. Also

$$\begin{aligned} jy_0 - y_1 &= (j - i)y_0 + iy_0 - y_1 \\ &= (j - i)y_0 + iy_0 - (jy_0 - jv_0 + v_1) \\ &= (j - i)y_0 + (i - j)y_0 + jv_0 - v_1 \\ &= jv_0 - v_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\langle y_0, y_1 \rangle \alpha_j \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$. □

Thus we see that $\text{Con}(\mathbb{Z}_p^2) \cong \mathbf{M}_{p+1}$. Now we define $\mathcal{M}$ to be the sublattice of $\text{Con}(\mathbb{Z}_p^2)$ consisting of the identity and universal relations, along with the atoms η_0, η_1 , and α_1 through α_n . Then $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbf{M}_{n+2}$.

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 2.1.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. First we establish the following claim: $\text{BA}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{RA}(\mathcal{M})$, where $\text{BA}(\mathcal{M})$ is the Boolean algebra generated by $\mathcal{M}$. The set $\text{At}(\text{BA}(\mathcal{M}))$ of atoms of $\text{BA}(\mathcal{M})$ consists of the identity relation $1'$ along with $\eta_0 \cap \overline{1'}$, $\eta_1 \cap \overline{1'}$, and $\alpha_1 \cap \overline{1'}$ through $\alpha_n \cap \overline{1'}$, and the one additional atom

$$\beta = 1' + \eta_0 + \eta_1 + \overline{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i}.$$

To see this, consider the η_i 's and α_j 's. Any distinct pair of these intersect to $1'$, so the $\eta_i \cap \overline{1'}$'s and $\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'}$'s are minimal nonzero elements, hence are atoms. The Boolean algebra generated by the η_i 's and the α_j 's will be the same as that generated by $1'$, the $\eta_i \cap \overline{1'}$'s and the $\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'}$'s.

By Proposition 4.4 of [3], the Boolean algebra generated by these atoms is equal to all joins of meets of atoms and their complements. Since the meet of an atom a with anything is either a or 0 , we need only consider joins of meets of complements of atoms. Since we are looking for the atoms of the Boolean algebra, we need only consider meets of complements of atoms. All such meets will be above the meet of all such complements, which is

$$\beta = \overline{1' \cdot \overline{\eta_0} \cdot \overline{\eta_1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \overline{\alpha_i}} = 1' + \eta_0 + \eta_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$$

Thus β is the only atom not previously listed.

We need to show that any composition of atoms is already in $\text{BA}(\mathcal{M})$. If $a \in \text{At}(\text{BA}(\mathcal{M}))$, then $a \circ a = 1' + a$, since a is an equivalence relation, “minus the identity”, that has no singleton equivalence classes. If $a \neq b \in \text{At}(\text{BA}(\mathcal{M}))$, then

$$a \circ b = \overline{1' + a + b}.$$

To establish this, we first prove that

$$(\alpha_i \cap \overline{1'}) \circ (\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'}) = \overline{1' + \alpha_i + \alpha_j}.$$

To establish the inclusion $(\alpha_i \cap \overline{1'}) \circ (\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'}) \supseteq \overline{1' + \alpha_i + \alpha_j}$, consider the proof of Case 2 of Lemma 3.1. It is not hard to check that if $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle$ and $\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$ are not related by $1'$, α_i , or α_j , then the pair $\langle y_0, y_1 \rangle$ given in the proof is distinct from both $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle$ and $\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$. Hence if

$$\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle \overline{1' + \alpha_i + \alpha_j} \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle,$$

then

$$\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle (\alpha_i \cap \overline{1'}) \circ (\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'}) \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle.$$

It remains to show that $(\alpha_i \cap \overline{1'}) \circ (\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'})$ contains nothing but $\overline{1' + \alpha_i + \alpha_j}$. Since $\alpha_i \cap \overline{1'}$ and $\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'}$ are disjoint symmetric diversity relations, their composition is disjoint from the identity. To prove that this composition is disjoint from α_i (and by symmetry from α_j as well), suppose for contradiction that there exist pairwise distinct pairs $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle, \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle, \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$ with $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle \alpha_i \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle \alpha_j \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$ and $\langle u_0, u_1 \rangle \alpha_i \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$. Then $iu_0 - u_1 = iy_0 - y_1 = iv_0 - v_1$ and $ju_0 - u_1 = jv_0 - v_1$.

Then $(j - i)y_0 = (j - i)v_0$, and so $y_0 = v_0$. Then $y_1 = v_1$ as well, a contradiction. By a similar argument, $(\eta_i \cap \overline{1'}) \circ (\alpha_j \cap \overline{1'}) = \overline{1'} + \eta_i + \alpha_j$.

Therefore, the composition of atoms is a boolean combination of those atoms. Since composition distributes over union, it follows that $\text{BA}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{RA}(\mathcal{M})$.

Now we are ready to show that $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{M}$. First, we note that η_0, η_1 , and α_1 through α_n are the minimal non-identity elements in $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M}))$. So suppose that there is some other relation $\gamma \in \text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M}))$. Since $\gamma \in \text{RA}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{BA}(\mathcal{M})$ and since γ is not an atom, γ must contain at least two atoms. Since γ also contains $1'$, γ contains two of the non-trivial relations $\{\eta_0, \eta_1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, hence $\gamma \circ \gamma = 1$. But $\gamma \circ \gamma = \gamma$, hence $\gamma = 1$. So the only non-trivial relations in $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M}))$ are $\{\eta_0, \eta_1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ along with the unit 1. Therefore $\text{Eq}(\text{RA}(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{M}$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] V.B. Bodnarchuk, L.A. Kalužnin, V.N. Kotov, and B.A. Romov. Galois theory for post algebras i, ii. *Kibernetika (Kiev)*. 3:1-10, 1969; 5:1-9, 1969.
- [2] R. Hirsch and I. Hodkinson. *Relation Algebras by Games*. Number 147 in Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2002.
- [3] Sabine Koppelberg. *Handbook of Boolean algebras. Vol. 1*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989. Edited by J. Donald Monk and Robert Bonnet.
- [4] R. C. Lyndon. Relation algebras and projective geometries. *Michigan Math. J.*, 8:21–28, 1961.
- [5] R. Pöschel. Galois connections for operations and relations. 2004. In: K. Denecke, M. Ern , S.L. Wismath (eds.): Galois connections and applications. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- [6] R. Pöschel and L. A. Kalužnin. *Funktionen und Relationenalgebren*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1979.
- [7] A. Tarski and S. Givant. *A formalization of set theory without variables*. Number 41 in Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1987.